

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

J.C. individually, and all others  
similarly situated,  
Plaintiffs

Civil Action  
No. 15-4745

v.

Nicholas Ford, Steffen Boyd,  
Josette Springer, Shonda Williams,  
John W. Harrison E. Martinez, Steven Austin,  
Darlene Miller, Charles Hoyt,  
Defendants

**FILED**  
JUN 12 2017  
KATE BARKMAN, Clerk  
By \_\_\_\_\_ Dep. Clerk

**PLAINTIFF'S RULE 59(E) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

NO, AS YOU LONG HAVE KNOWN, YOU REFER TO PLAINTIFF AS J.C., MR. C, or SIMPLY AS PLAINTIFF AT ALL TIMES INCLUDING SUITS YOU ALLEGE TO BE PLAINTIFF. You will be sued just for this, I am going to sue you directly. You refuse to follow the law, refuse to heed commands and warnings, this is just an extension of it. So now you will get sued. You also have complaints, it's like a book, contains your whole negative history- which is your history, coming to most of the federal government including Sen, Leahy, other senators, the Supreme Court including Justice Ginsburg. I realize I am dealing with somebody so pathetic that they had to actually purchase robe. You don't do anything respectable at all, have not ever done so in your life. No you do not mention any other alleged lawsuits we are in this one.

NO THIS CASE WAS TRANSFERRED TO YOU BECAUSE YOU BEGGED HIM IN AUGUST OF 2015 TO ISSUE A FRIVOLOUS TRANSFER so you can destroy both cases long

before trial and then after cranking out baseless filings left and right for 2.5 years, immediately and disgracefully put another case on ice you thought was this plaintiff despite not even knowing his name. Disgracefully stayed that case for two whole years so you can destroy both, who you allege it is the same plaintiff. This is another reason why you had to buy a robe. First off, you don't **even know** Plaintiff's name so you cannot match it up with anything and no contrary, **AS WORKING EYES CAN SEE THEY are not the same facts, parties, circumstances, claims, time period** as that other alleged case. More clear errors. And on top of this, that other alleged case you allege is the same plaintiff **should have never gone to you to begin with** as a motion for reassignment filed in that case details.

Per 40.1 (b) (3), at the time that alleged case was filed, there was absolutely no case that even remotely was closely related to on any level, no offenders at all, no claims, circumstances, facts, nothing relating to property, the validity or infringement of a patent. Nothing at all. Another major and clear error. That itself should have never, ever would up in your dirty paws. That case without any question or dispute must be randomly reassigned, and to a real court. Likewise, right off the top before anything, this suit, in which apparently you think is the same plaintiff, must automatically do the same for the same reason, it should never have gone to you.

Prior to the baseless transfer you begged him for, that dope "granted" their "motion to dismiss as to all offenders except criminal Ford". **NO YOUR VISION WENT OUT ON YOU AGAIN, NO AGAIN THEIR WAS NEVER ANY BRIEFING AT ALL FROM THESE OFFENDERS, THEY NEVER FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS, IT WAS HIM ISSUING THE FIRST FULLY BOGUS SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL THAT THEN GOT REVERSED, THEN THE VERY NEXT DAY AFTER IT WAS SENT BACK HE THEN PROCLAIMED YOU HAD ISSUED ANOTHER BOGUS SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL** and asked the offenders

to reply to that long after you had already done that, they had never filed anything at any time matter of fact.

Get rid of your vision problems and look at the January 6th filing two sentence bogus order that "the parties shall be afforded 30 days to brief, whether Plaintiff can adequately state a claim against Defendants in their individual capacity." And it was also another violation of basic procedure and due process because they could have chose to "answer" the complaint, even in their meritless reply to his illegal sua sponte dismissal they conceded Plaintiff made most of his claims, and lack no merit in the parts they denied. Consequently there THERE IS NO MOTION TO DEFER AND IT IS ONE OR THE OTHER NOT BOTH. Makes the one before it a quadruple clear error, both on merit alone, and the fact that he could not dismiss parties/claims then purport to transfer the case, let alone just dismiss them to help a meritless transfer along. It's either one or the other. It's illegal in four ways.

No, in addition to not having any valid jurisdiction on either case, obviously YOU HAVE NO JURISDICTION, CANNOT DEAL with a reconsideration on SOMEBODY ELSE'S FILING. That's preposterous like everything is you do. Again more reasons why you had to buy a robe. It's obviously void ab initio, like it never happened, just like your appointment. It needs to be vacated on that alone. The same for the motion for certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), no jurisdiction, it was on that dope's filings, he had to deal with it. And NO YOU DO NOT DENY PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS let alone summarily deny them, yet again without proper review.

## **I. Reconsideration**

For the motion for reconsideration which again you have no jurisdiction, in three different ways, another one sentence whitewash, like a million before it in which you claim it is the same

plaintiff, denied without proper review. Again, more reasons why you had to buy a robe. The correct standard of review is on Plaintiff's motion, not what any friend of criminals wants it to be<sup>1</sup>. No Plaintiff has well met the threshold. Contrary, in reality Plaintiff's comprehensive 30 page motion was properly filed and indisputably raised countless issues for reversal of that bogus filing which ignored everything on the motions (again), all the correct facts (changed facts), claims, correct applicable law, clear errors of law, evidence, a bogus "judgment" that is void, bogus transfers that is void, failed to adhere to not only controlling law, but rules and procedure, all of which were in place to stop exactly what you did. and more. None of this was new and he was entitled to have everything actually considered<sup>2</sup>. This also includes the fact that jurisdiction, including transfer has to always be decided first, and if a real court "decides that it lacks jurisdiction, it cannot decide the merits it has no authority to do so". Ray v. Eyster, 132 F.3d 152, 155 (3d Cir. 1997). Obviously, the errors of law are clear and that adherence to them would

---

<sup>1</sup> "A motion for reconsideration performs a valuable function" in law. Arlington V. The County Of Dekalb, (N.D. Ind. Mar. 22nd, 2006). A motion for reconsideration is proper for factual and legal matters that may (were here) have overlooked. Glendon Energy Co. v. Borough of Glendon, 836 F. Supp. 1109, 1122 (E.D. Pa. 1993). It doesn't say whether it must be unintentional or not. Not surprisingly, you again completely either ignored or changed the facts, ignored proper law and more. A reconsideration is also appropriate when a court has "patently misunderstood a party, has made a decision outside the adversarial issues presented to the Court by the parties, has made an error not of reasoning but of apprehension, Broadus v. Shields, 665 F.3d 846, 860 (7th Cir. 2011); Singh v. George Washington Univ., 383 F. Supp. 2d 99, 101 (D.D.C. 2005); Bank of Waunake v. Rochester Cheese Sales, Inc., 906 F.2d 1185, 1191 (7th Cir. 1990). "Errors of apprehension may include a court's failure to consider 'controlling decisions or data that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.'" Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995).

<sup>2</sup> It does not offer new evidence, it points TO BLACK AND WHITE FACTS AND DOCUMENTS you disgracefully changed/ignored completely as well, as everything else listed. Such evidence and law "will reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court". Shrader, 70 F.3d at 257. See also Smith v. Perlman, 2014 WL (N.D.N.Y.Dec. 19, 2014):

Thus, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration does not attempt to raise arguments or evidence Plaintiff neglected to put forth earlier, but rather urges the Court to grant due consideration to overlooked evidence Plaintiff presented. Along with his reply papers, Plaintiff filed approximately 185 pages of exhibits, including, inter alia, Defendants' responses to interrogatories, records related to Plaintiff's grievances filed with DOCCS, and various DOCCS internal communications and policy materials. See Dkt. No. 88-3. Such evidence "might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court". Shrader, 70 F.3d at 257. In the interest of avoiding manifest injustice, Plaintiff is entitled to have the Court consider this evidence. Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is GRANTED and the Court's Order dated March 13, 2014 is VACATED.

create a manifest injustice. The motion more than states a basis for Rule 59(e) relief, for a real court that is, not one who bought their way in.

## **II. Motion for certification under 1292(b)**

As far as the motion for certification under 1292(b), which again you have no jurisdiction, another one sentence whitewash, like a million before it in which you claim it is the same plaintiff, denied without proper review. Again more reasons why you had to buy a robe. No Plaintiff has well met the threshold. As already stated, it's clear there are a number of "questions" of law and other issues that need to be addressed upstairs from what is going on here, including judicial usurpation of power. Controlling legal questions necessary for the disposition of the case including a frivolous transfer under the supposed first filed rule, camouflaged as a local rule, that would be just as baseless if it was and it wasn't. A (another one) bogus dismissal of parties and claims that are illegal for no less than three reasons and more. An appeal is needed now to materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation as it would most certainly affect the outcome of this matter. Nothing involves any issues of fact or evidence. As Plaintiff pointed out the offenders did not even attempt to object to this. The last thing you want is a 1292, even though you quickly and happily did the same thing two years ago, because you know the criminals will promptly be put back in and the case will be yanked from you, among other things.

## **CONCLUSION**

This motion gets granted, the criminals and claims against go back in, this case gets randomly assigned or goes back to the other one.

J.C., Plaintiff

Dated: June 5th, 2017